

REMARKS

Claims 5-7, 9, 11, 12, and 14-18 are pending in the current application.

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 1, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant amends claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 17 to overcome this rejection and correct minor typographical and grammatical errors in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 5-7, 9, 11, 12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art Figures 1A-1E and the related disclosure (hereinafter "ARA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,022,753 to Park et al. (hereinafter "Park") in view of U.S. Patent 6,077,643 to Kumar et al. (hereinafter "Kumar"). Applicants amend claims 7, 14, and 16 to more particularly recite the features of Applicants' invention.

The rejection of independent claims 5 and 14 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 5 and dependent claims 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "coating a negative-type photoresist on the transparent conductive film and forming an exposed area defining a pixel area". Independent claim 14 and dependent claims 15-18 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "exposing the negative-type photoresist with an image of a pixel electrode, wherein the image of a pixel electrode does not fully extend across the data line and the gate line; developing the negative-type photoresist such that the unexposed area of the

negative-type photoresist is removed and a portion of the transparent conductive film is exposed”. None of the cited references including the ARA, Park or Kumar, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this claimed feature.

The Examiner acknowledges that neither ARA nor Kumar disclose “coating a negative-type photoresist on the transparent conductive film and forming an exposed area defining a pixel area” (claim 5) or “exposing the negative-type photoresist with an image of a pixel electrode, wherein the image of a pixel electrode does not fully extend across the data line and the gate line; developing the negative-type photoresist such that the unexposed area of the negative-type photoresist is removed and a portion of the transparent conductive film is exposed” (claim 14). The Examiner seeks to combine Park with Kumar to supply this deficiency. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to combine Park and Kumar because they teach away from each other.

For example, Park discloses that “forming the pixel electrode by using the negative photoresist, pixel defects decrease when compared with when using the a positive photoresist” (Park, column 5, lines 16-19). However, Kumar discloses “polymers of the invention are highly useful as the resin binder component in...chemically-amplified positive resists” (Kumar, column 6, lines 56-59). Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Park, which discusses negative photoresists, with Kumar, which discusses positive photoresists. Furthermore, Park and Kumar are not combinable because the processing methods and conditions for negative photoresists are different from and incompatible with those for a positive photoresist.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 and dependent claims 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12 that depend from claim 5, and claim 14 and claims 15-18 that depend from claim 14, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

George G. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant